REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended to address the teachings of the references cited in the Office Action.

No new matter is added to the application by this Amendment.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiners Khan and Dougon in the August 8, 2007 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

A. Marshall and JP 479

Claims 1-4 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,800,117 ("Marshall") in view of JP 10-140479 ("JP 479"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed to during the interview and suggested by Examiner Dougon, claim 1 has been amended to recite "a method for production of seat belt webbing consisting of weaving the webbing from at least two synthetic yarns of different colors, wherein at least one yarn is spun-dyed, and subsequently subjecting the webbing to treatment in a water-bath containing at least one disperse dye."

Neither Marshall nor JP 479, taken singly or in combination, teaches or suggests a method for production of seat belt webbing consisting of weaving the webbing from at least two synthetic yarns of different colors, wherein at least one yarn is spun-dyed, and subsequently subjecting the webbing to treatment in a water-bath containing at least one disperse dye as recited in amended claim 1.

Marshall and JP 479 do not teach or suggest a method that is limited to weaving the webbing from at least two synthetic yarns of different colors, wherein at least one yarn is

spun-dyed, and subsequently subjecting the webbing to treatment in a water-bath containing at least one disperse dye as recited in claim 1. Thus, Marshall and/or JP 479 would not have rendered the features of claim 1 obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least these reasons, claims 1-4 and 9-11 are patentable over the applied references. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

B. Marshall, JP 479 and GB 327

Claims 5-9 and 12-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Marshall and JP 479, and further in view of GB 2,040,327 ("GB 327"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

None of Marshall, JP 479 and GB 327, taken singly or in combination, teach or suggest a method for production of seat belt webbing consisting of weaving the webbing from at least two synthetic yarns of different colors, wherein at least one yarn is spun-dyed, and subsequently subjecting the webbing to treatment in a water-bath containing at least one disperse as recited in claim 1.

GB 327 was cited as allegedly teaching spun-dyed yarns for use in seat belt webbing which comprise polyethylene terephthalate of tensile strength 50/90cN/tex and spun-dyed yarns with bright colors. However, GB 327 does not remedy the deficiencies of Marshall and JP 479 as described above with respect to claim 1, from which claims 5-9 and 12-16 depend.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-9 and 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

C. Marshall, JP 479 and Van Leeuwen

Claims 5-8 and 12-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Marshall and JP 479, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,473,617 ("Van Leeuwen"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Nowhere does Van Leeuwen teach or suggest a method for production of seat belt webbing consisting of weaving the webbing from at least two synthetic yarns of different colors, wherein at least one yarn is spun-dyed, and subsequently subjecting the webbing to treatment in a water-bath containing at least one disperse dye as recited in claim 1.

Van Leeuwen does not remedy the deficiencies of Marshall and JP 479 as described above with respect to claim 1, from which claims 5-8 and 12-16 depend.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-8 and 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-16 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

William P. Berridge
Registration No. 30,024

Brian C. Anscomb
Registration No. 48,641

WPB:BCA/hs

Date: August 9, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461